



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/139,798	08/25/1998	WILLIAM L THOMAS	UV-57	5738

7590 02/27/2003
G VICTOR TREYZ
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100201104

EXAMINER

HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FD

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/139,798

Applicant(s)

THOMAS ET AL. 

Examiner

Son P Huynh

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-39 and 41-118 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-39 and 41-118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-39 and 41-118 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-39, 41-52, 54-60, 63-65, 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (US 6,177,931), and in view of Seidman (US 6,298,482) and further in view of Guyot et al. (US 6,119,098).

Regarding claim 1, Alexander et al. (hereafter referred to as Alexander) teaches a system in which advertisements are displayed for users by an interactive television program guide implemented on user television equipment, comprising means for

Art Unit: 2611

displaying the advertisements on the user television equipment with the interactive television program guide (see figure 1). However, Alexander does not explicitly disclose means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements in the interactive television program by collecting information on the number of times each advertisement is displayed.

Seidman teaches means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander to incorporate the feature as taught by Seidman in order to provide advertisement to targeted user thereby increase efficiency for advertiser. However, neither Alexander nor Seidman discloses collecting information on the number of times each advertisement is displayed.

Guyot teaches collecting information on the number of times each advertisement is displayed (see col. 4, line 35-col. 5, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander and Seidman to incorporate the feature as taught by Guyot in order to allow the advertiser to monitor the number of times a particular advertisement has already been displayed.

Regarding claim 2, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on the amount that the advertisements are displayed- number of commercials viewed (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 3, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprising channel, program name, program category, name of selected object, sub-selection information (see figure 4). Thus, Seidman teaches the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the location in the program guide where the advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 4, Seidman discloses the system comprises means for collecting information on which advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 5, Seidman the collecting information comprises the name of program, the name of object selected (see figure 4). Thus, the system comprises means for collecting advertisement identifier information, which identifies which advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 7, Seidman teaches the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on which program guide screens advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 8, Seidman discloses once the user has selected from among the alternatives which are displayed, the STB relays this selection to the head end, in addition to storing the selection information in the user's selection history (see col. 5, lines 53-56). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on which screens are active when a given one of the advertisements is selected by one of the users.

Regarding claim 9, Seidman discloses once the user has selected from among the alternatives which are displayed, the STB relays this selection to the head end, in addition to storing the selection information in the user's selection history (see col. 5, lines 53-56). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on which user actions result directly from selection of a given one of the advertisements by one of the users.

Regarding claim 10, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the times that advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 11, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on the times that actions are taken automatically by the program guide (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 12, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises channel number, program name, category name, object name, sub-selection

Art Unit: 2611

information, (see figure 4). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on which screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 13, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises channel number, program name, category name, object name, sub-selection information, (see figure 4). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting screen identifier information that uniquely identifies which program guide screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 14, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises tuned channel (see figure 4). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on the frequency with which certain program guide screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 15, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises tune begin, tune end (see figure 4). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on the duration for which program guide screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 16, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on how users arrive at program guide screens in the program guide (see figure 2A-3).

Regarding claim 17, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on which television programs are displayed on the user television equipment (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 18, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on whether a user interacts with the program guide during the display of a given program on the user television equipment (see figures 2A-3).

Regarding claim 20, Alexander in view of Seidman and Guyot teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Seidman further discloses the detailed description of viewing behavior and activity is monitored and recorded in the selection history records 13 (see col. 6, lines 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for collecting information on whether a screen overlay is present on the user television equipment during the display of a given program on the user television equipment in order to provide a detailed description of user behavior.

Regarding claim 21, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on which non-program guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figures 4 – 6).

Regarding claim 22, Seidman discloses means for collecting information with the program guide on which non-program guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 23, Seidman discloses whenever user selects a program or message from the menu, the selection information is recorded in the selection history (see figures 2B -4). Thus, Seidman teaches means for collecting information on how users invoke non-program guide applications on the user television equipment.

Regarding claim 24, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the amount that non-program-guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 25, Seidman discloses the advertisements are transmitted to user television from CATV head end, the system further comprises means for monitoring when advertisements that are transmitted from the CATV head end to the user television equipment (see col. 4, line 40 – col. 5, line 62).

Regarding claim 26, Seidman discloses the advertisements are transmitted to the user television equipment from the head end; and means for monitoring when advertisements that are transmitted from the head end are received at the user television equipment (see col. 6, lines 9-25).

Regarding claim 29, Seidman discloses the collecting information on the user activity is transmitted from the user television equipment to a data processing facility (head end), and the head end generates "summary"-type historical reports (see figure 6) and "detailed" type reports (see figure 7) according to the collected information (see col. 7, lines 39-43). Obviously, the system comprising means for filtering out less important information from the collected information at the head end in order to reduce upstream bandwidth.

Regarding claim 30, Alexander in view of Seidman and Guyot teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 29. Official Notice is taken that filtering based on specific advertisements is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander, Seidman and Guyot with a well-known technique of filtering based on specific advertisements in order to provide a quality collected information.

Regarding claim 31, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on advertisements usage comprises means for collecting information for multiple user profiles (see figures 5-7).

Regarding claim 33, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the usage of

Art Unit: 2611

the advertisements in the interactive television program guide by substantially all users of the system (see figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 34, Seidman discloses when Viewer Response Monitoring System is installed on the user's premises equipment (and optionally when other viewers wish to use the system), a viewer profile 12 is created for the user and stored in the STB RAM (see col. 6, lines 26-37). Thus, Seidman teaches the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements in the interactive television program guide by a subset of users of the system.

Regarding claims 35-39, 41-52, 54-60, 63-65, 67-68, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-34 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 1-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-34.

4. Claims 19, 27-28, 53, 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (US 6,177,931), and in view of Seidman (US 6,298,482) and Guyot et al. (US 6,119,098), and further in view of Aras et al. (5,872,588).

Regarding claim 19, Alexander in view of Seidman and Guyot teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Alexander further discloses the EPG records whether the viewer changes the volume of the television audio (see col. 28, lines 46-49). However, Alexander does not explicitly disclose means for collecting information on whether the user television equipment is muted during the display of the given program on the user television equipment.

Aras discloses separate AVI information for audio and video portions of AVMs may be utilized. Thus, objectionable language may be silenced while the video portion is presented (see col. 10, lines 17-20), and the user behaviors such are channel change, swap, pause, rewind, off, mute, record, etc. These responses may be to change a state variable, or to record information in the behavior collection table (see col. 14, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander, Seidman and Guyot to incorporate a means as taught by Aras in order to allow advertiser to avoid using audio advertisements in the program.

Regarding claim 27, Aras discloses the advertisements are transmitted to the video distribution node from broadcast server and ITV server (see figure 1A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander, Guyot and Seidman to incorporate server as taught by Aras in order to reduce capacity of advertisements stored at the head end. In addition, it would

Art Unit: 2611

have been obvious that the server comprising means for monitoring when advertisements are transmitted from the server to the video distribution node in order to control the transmission.

Regarding claim 28, Aras discloses behavior of subscriber is transmitted from the user television equipment to a behavior collection center (see figure 4A). Aras further discloses collected information in the behavior collection table can be deleted, updated (see col. 14, lines 8-12). Obviously, Aras teaches means for filtering out less important information from the collected information prior to transmission of the collected information from the user television equipment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alexander, Seidman and Guyot to incorporate the features as taught by Aras in order to provide a quality report to the provider.

Regarding claims 53, 61-62, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 19, 27-28 respectively and are analyzed with respect to the rejection of claims 19, 27-28.

5. Claims 32 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Alexander et al. (US 6,177,931), and in view of Seidman (US 6,298,482) and Guyot et al. (US 6,119,098), and further in view of Furuya et al. (US 5,886,691).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claim 32, Alexander in view of Seidman and Guyot teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Seidman further disclosed messages pertaining to the embedded data may or may not be filtered out by the microcontroller, depending on the viewer's history and interests (see col. 8, lines 21-50). However, Seidman does not explicitly disclose displaying the real time ratings information on the user television equipment.

Furuya discloses displaying the real time ratings information on the user television equipment (see 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander, Guyot and Seidman to incorporate means for displaying the real-time rating information as taught by Furuya in order to provide ratings information to user.

Regarding claim 66, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 32 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claim 32.

6. Claims 69-86, 89-90, 92-109, 112-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh et al. (US 6,112,186) in view of Furuya et al. (US 5,886,691).

Regarding claim 69, Bergh teaches a system comprises means for collecting real

Art Unit: 2611

time ratings information based on the activities of users at user television equipment (see col. 4, lines 34-67). However, Bergh does not specifically disclose means for displaying the real time ratings information on the user television equipment in real time.

Furuya teaches means for displaying the real time ratings information on the user television equipment in real time (see figure 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bergh to incorporate the feature as taught by Furuya in order to provide rating information to viewer.

Regarding claim 70, Furuya teaches a means for providing an opportunity for defining a time frame for the real time ratings – 1995 ranking- (see figure 9).

Regarding claims 71-75, Bergh in view of Furuya teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 70. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate means for providing an opportunity for defining a time frame of a particular hour, evening, day, week, instant for the real time ratings in order to provide rating of programs in a particular period of time, which would be the most interest to the consumers.

Regarding claim 76, Bergh in view of Furuya teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for providing an opportunity for selecting a geographic area for the real time ratings in order to provide user a rating of a particular geographic area, which would be the most relevant to the consumers in a particular area.

Regarding claim 77, Bergh teaches means for providing an opportunity for selecting a genre for the real time ratings (col. 14, lines 38-53).

Regarding claims 78-81, Bergh in view of Furuya teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. Official Notice is taken that selecting real time rating for television programs, applications, non-program guide applications, video games are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bergh and Furuya to incorporate the well-known features in the art in order to allow provider providing a desired television program guide, applications, non-program guide applications, video games to viewer.

Regarding claims 82-83, Furuya discloses means for displaying the real-time ratings information (see figure 10). Official Notice is taken that displaying real time television program ratings, real-time video game ratings are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bergh and Furuya to incorporate the well-known features

Art Unit: 2611

in the art in order to display real time television program ratings, real time video game ratings to viewer.

Regarding claim 86, Furuya teaches means for allowing each user to select type of real time ratings are displayed (see figure 10).

Regarding claim 89, Furuya teaches the real time ratings information comprises a list of programs (see figure 10). It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that to include means for selecting one of the programs to purchase in order to allow viewer to viewer program by selecting the program.

Regarding claim 90, Furuya teaches the real time ratings information comprises a list of programs (see figure 10). Official Notice is taken that select one of the program to set a reminder for the selected program is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that to include a well-known feature in the art in order to remind viewer of the selected program in the future.

Regarding claims 84-85, the elements correspond to the elements of claim 72 and 75 respectively and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 72 and 75.

Regarding claims 92-93, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 69-70, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 69-70.

Regarding claims 94-99, 107-108, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the system being claimed in claims 71-76 and 84-85 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 71-76 and 84-85.

Regarding claims 100-106, 109, 112-113, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 77-83, 86, 89-90 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 77-83, 86, 89-90

7. Claims 87-88, 110-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh et al. (US 6,112,186) in view of Furuya et al. (US 5,886,691), and in view of Aras et al. (5,872,588).

Regarding claim 87, Bergh in view of Furuya teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. However, neither Bergh nor Furuya explicitly discloses means for collecting information on whether a muting function is used when certain programs are watched.

Art Unit: 2611

Aras discloses separate AVI information for audio and video portions of AVMs may be utilized. Thus, objectionable language may be silenced while the video portion is presented (see col. 10, lines 17-20), and the user behaviors such are channel change, swap, pause, rewind, off, mute, record, etc. These responses may be to change a state variable, or to record information in the behavior collection table (see col. 14, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bergh and Furuya to incorporate a means as taught by Aras in order to allowed provider to avoid using audio in the program.

Regarding claim 88, Aras discloses each subscriber activity such as channel change or AVM stream change, pause, stop, picture in picture swap etc. or a filtered subset will be recorded (see col. 7, lines 18-20). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bergh and Furuya to incorporate means for collecting information on whether any portion of the video of a program is blocked as that program is watched in order to allow provider avoid transferring the blocked program in the future.

Regarding claims 110-111, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 87-88 respective and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 87-88.

Art Unit: 2611

8. Claims 91 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh et al. (US 6,112,186) in view of Furuya et al. (US 5,886,691), and in view of Herz et al. (US 5,351,075).

Regarding claim 91, Bergh in view of Furuya teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. Furuya further discloses the real time ratings information comprises a list of programs (see figure 9). However, Furuya does not explicitly disclose means for selecting one of the programs to record.

Herz discloses means for selecting one of the programs to record (see col. 5, lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bergh and Furuya to incorporate means for selecting one of the programs to record as taught by Herz in order to allow view to watch the program later.

Regarding claim 114, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 91 and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 91.

9. Claims 115-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (US 6,177,931), and in view of Guyot et al. (US 6,119,098).

Regarding claim 115, Alexander teaches means for displaying program guide

Art Unit: 2611

display screens on the user television equipment with the interactive television program guide (see figure 1). Alexander further discloses the EPG records the viewer's actions and the circumstances surrounding those actions (see col. 28, lines 30-67). However, Alexander does not specifically teach collecting information on which program guide display screens are displayed.

Guyot discloses Subscriber Statistics includes the advertisements distributed to the subscriber, the number of times each advertisement has been effectively displayed on the subscriber system (see col. 4, line 15- col. 5, 27). Thus, it is necessary to include means for collecting information on display screens are displayed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander to incorporate the feature as taught by Guyot in order to allow provider to monitor what has been displayed on the screen.

Regarding claim 116, the limitations as claimed correspond to the limitations of the system as claimed in claim 115 and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 115.

Regarding claim 117, Alexander teaches means for displaying program guide display screens on the user television equipment with the interactive television program guide (see figure 1). Alexander further discloses the EPG records the viewer's actions and the circumstances surrounding those actions (see col. 28, lines 30-67).

Art Unit: 2611

However, Alexander does not specifically teach collecting information on which non-program guide applications are used.

Guyot discloses the Client Application Software data includes information on the latest version of the client application software, and the URL address of the latest version of the client application software; the Subscriber Context includes Ad player Identification which is a unique identifier of the type of client software that must be used to display advertisement, and the processor upload the Subscriber context to the server (see col. 4, line 24-col. 5, line 27). Thus, it is necessary to include means for collecting information on which non-program guide applications are used to collect information of application used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to modify Alexander to incorporate the feature as taught by Guyot in order to allow provider to collect information of the applications used at the subscriber thereby allowing provider to provide a quality services in the future.

Regarding claim 118, the limitations being claimed correspond to the limitations of the system as claimed in claim 117 and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 117.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hendricks et al. (US 6,463,585) teaches targeted advertisement using television delivery system.

Reilly et al. (US 5,740,549) teaches information and advertising distribution system and method.

Fite et al. (US 5,557,721) teaches method and apparatus for displaying screen and coupons.

Ebisawa (US 5,886,731) teaches video data receiving apparatus, video data transmitting apparatus, and broadcasting system.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-1889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 2611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Son P. Huynh
February 14, 2003


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600